

COPY

1 ARDENT LAW GROUP, P.C.
 2 Hubert H. Kuo (Cal. Bar No. 204036)
 3 Alexander J. Chang (Cal. Bar No. 247921)
 4 2600 Michelson Dr., Suite 1700
 5 Irvine, CA 92612
 Telephone: (949) 863-9782
 Facsimile: (949) 863-9783
 Email: hkuo@ardentlawgroup.com
 achang@ardentlawgroup.com

6 Attorneys of Record for Plaintiff
 BOILING POINT CORPORATION, a California corporation

7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
 LOS ANGELES

2012 DEC -3 AM 10:53

FILED

CV12-10292 -DS
 (ASW)

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 BOILING POINT CORPORATION,
 11 a California corporation,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 W. STAGE CATS, INC., a California
 15 corporation, dba HOT SPOT
 16 TAIWANESE RESTAURANT; YU-
 CHIEN WENG, an individual; and
 17 DOES 1-10, inclusive,

18 Defendants.

19 Case No.:

20 COMPLAINT FOR:

- (1) FEDERAL TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT [15 U.S.C. § 1144/Lanham Act §32(a)];
- (2) FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN [15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)/Lanham Act §43(a)];
- (3) FEDERAL TRADEMARK DILUTION [15 U.S.C. §1125(c)];
- (4) FEDERAL UNFAIR COMPETITION [15 U.S.C. §1125(a)];
- (5) UNFAIR COMPETITION (CALIFORNIA COMMON LAW); AND
- (6) CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION [CALIFORNIA BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE§ 17200, *et seq.*]

21 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

22 //
 23 //
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 Plaintiff BOILING POINT CORPORATION ("Plaintiff"), by their attorneys,
 2 as and for their Complaint against Defendants W. STAGE CATS, INC., dba HOT
 3 SPOT TAIWANESE RESTAURANT; YU-CHIEN WENG; and DOES 1-10,
 4 inclusive ("Defendants") alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter pursuant to 15
 7 U.S.C. §1121 and/or 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and/or 1338(a).

8 2. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants since Defendants
 9 have committed acts of trademark infringement and unfair competition in this
 10 district and/or Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts with this district to
 11 such that the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendants by this Court does not offend
 12 traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Among other things,
 13 Defendants have advertised, offered to sell and sold products that infringe the
 14 trademark of Plaintiff to consumers within this judicial district, knowing or having
 15 reason to know that consumers, including within this judicial district, would
 16 purchase said goods from Defendants, believing that they were authentic goods
 17 produced by and/or associated with Plaintiff or its authorized licensees.

18 3. Additionally, supplemental jurisdiction exists over Defendants because
 19 on information and belief, Defendants conduct business in California and in this
 20 judicial district, have purposefully directed action to California and this district, or
 21 have otherwise availed themselves of the privileges and protections of the laws of
 22 the State of California, such that this Court's assertion of jurisdiction over
 23 Defendants does not offend traditional notions affair play and due process.

24 4. Venue is proper, *inter alia*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because on
 25 information and belief, a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to
 26 the claim occurred in this judicial district, and has caused damages to Plaintiff in
 27 this district.

28 //

THE PARTIES

5. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, having a principal place of business at 14278 Valley Blvd., #A, La Puente, California 91746.

6. Upon information and belief, Defendant W. STAGE CATS, INC., dba HOT SPOT TAIWANESE RESTAURANT (“HOT SPOT”) is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, having its principal place of business at 18246 E. Gale Avenue, Suite B, City of Industry, California 91748.

7. Upon information and belief, Defendant HOT SPOT is owned, in whole or part, by Defendant YU-CHIEN WENG.

8. Upon information and belief, Defendant YU-CHIEN WENG is an individual residing at 11007 Palm Boulevard, #211, Los Angeles, California 90034.

9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, of Defendants herein named as DOES 1-10, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. When the true names and capacities of said Defendants have been ascertained, Plaintiff will amend this pleading accordingly.

10. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants and DOES 1-10, inclusive, sued herein by fictitious names are jointly, severally and concurrently liable and responsible with the named Defendants upon the causes of action hereinafter set forth.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times mentioned herein Defendants, and DOES 1-10, inclusive, and each of them, were the agents, servants and employees of every other Defendant and the acts of each Defendant, as alleged herein, were performed within the course and scope of that agency, service or employment.

11

FACTS

12. Since 2004, Plaintiff has been operating a well known successful business offering restaurant services featuring individual Taiwanese hot pot soup served in a wok style or soup bowl containing a variety of meats, vegetables, and tofu, in particular stinky tofu which is unique to Taiwan. In particular and among other areas, Plaintiff operates numerous restaurant locations in and around the Los Angeles County and Orange County areas with plans to expand to other areas in and around the Southern California.

13. Plaintiff's restaurants are highly successful and because of the quality of its hot pot soup products, the term "STINKY STINKY WOK and/or STINKY STINKY POT" have become highly distinctive in the use of individual Taiwanese hot pot based soup services and products within the industry. Due to its heavy investment of financial resources and time, the public has come to associate the STINKY STINKY marks with the high quality products and services related to Plaintiff's restaurants. Thus, the STINKY STINKY marks have acquired secondary meaning and a high level of distinction within the hot pot soup industry.

14. Plaintiff is the owner of Federal Trademark Registration No. 3802381 (also referred as “Plaintiff’s Trademark”) on the mark  , which translates in English as “STINKY STINKY WOK” or “STINKY STINKY POT.” A true and correct copy of the ‘281 Registration is attached as Exhibit “1.” Thus, Plaintiff has a presumption of validity and ownership in the above stated mark.


15. In and around October 24, 2012, Plaintiff discovered that the Defendants were operating a restaurant serving identical individual Taiwanese hot pot soup products in the Los Angeles County area. In particular, Defendants' have been using the  mark to market its goods and services and to attract customers.

11

11

1 16. Upon information and belief, Defendants have been operating their
2 restaurant since April, 2012. A true and correct copy of Defendants' infringing
3 activities is attached as Exhibit "2."

4 17. Defendants have used the  mark in connection
5 with Defendants' restaurant business which is in direct competition with Plaintiff
6 because both restaurants offer the individual Taiwanese hot pot soup goods. In
7 addition, both restaurants market in the same channels and serve the same class of
8 purchasers. Defendants have thus used Plaintiff's trademark in its advertising for
9 such products and services, thereby competing unfairly with Plaintiff, infringing its
10 trademark, and improperly trading on the goodwill established by Plaintiff.

11 18. Because of Defendants' infringing activities, Plaintiff has been
12 damaged by ~~as a result of its~~ customers likely being confused in regards to the
13 source of the  mark. In addition, Defendants' use of the
14 aforementioned trademark has and continues to dilute Plaintiff's goodwill in its
15 products and business that it has invested significant time and resources.

16 19. Upon learning of the Defendants infringing activities and as a good
17 faith effort to resolve the matter quickly, Plaintiff forwarded Defendants a cease and
18 desist letter on or about November 5, 2012 providing notice of Plaintiff's trademark
19 rights and a request that Defendant immediately cease and desist all continued use
20 of the  mark. A true and correct copy of the cease and desist
21 letter is attached as Exhibit "3."

22 20. Upon information and belief, despite Defendants' cease and desist
23 demands Defendants have persisted in willfully infringing Plaintiff's trademark
24 rights by continuing to use its identical mark that is likely to cause confusion in the
25 marketplace between Plaintiff and Defendants' goods and services.

26 //

27 //

28 //

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Federal Trademark Infringement Against All Defendants)

[15 U.S.C. § 1114/ Lanham Act §32(a)]

21. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates in this Cause paragraphs 1-20 as though restated herein full.

22. Plaintiff's United States Trademark Registration No. 3802381 for the mark  is attached as Exhibit "1," is for use with "Restaurant services featuring soup served in a wok style or soup bowl containing a variety of meats, vegetables and tofu, stinky tofu."

23. Defendants use, sale and/or advertising of its identical or confusingly similar mark will likely cause confusion in the marketplace in regard to the source of the goods/services related to the **臭臭鍋** mark. Currently, Defendants use its confusingly identical mark on at least their restaurant menu. Attached as Exhibit “2,” are examples of Defendants infringing activities.

24. Without Plaintiff's consent, Defendants have knowingly used Plaintiff's registered trademark to intentionally trade upon Plaintiff's established goodwill and reputation, and to cause confusion, to cause mistake, and to deceive, entitling Plaintiff, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117, to recovery of (1) Defendants' profits; (2) Plaintiff's damages, including lost profits; and (3) costs of the action. Plaintiff is further entitled to trebled damages above the amount of actual damages in a sum of not more than three times the amount of actual damages. Defendants' willful and egregious conduct makes this case exceptional further entitling Plaintiff to an award of attorney fees.

25. The Defendants' infringement of Plaintiff's registered trademark have also irreparably injured Plaintiff in ways that cannot be compensated by monetary means and which such injury will continue unless permanently enjoined by the Court.

11

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(False Designation of Origin Against All Defendants)

[15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)/Lanham Act §43(a)]

26. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates in this Cause paragraphs 1-20 as though restated herein in full.

27. Defendants have used Plaintiff's registered trademark or confusingly similar marks similar thereto, in commerce in connection with its own goods, which use is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the origin, sponsorship, association or approval of such goods.

28. By utilizing the **臭臭鍋** mark in its advertising for, and in connection with its actual products, Defendants have misrepresented and falsely described to the general public the origin and the source of the products offered for sale and creates a likelihood of confusion, mistake or deception to ultimate purchasers as to the source of the products.

29. For example, Defendants market, conduct business and publicly represent that the  trademark is associated or connected to the Defendants' business thereby creating a false designation of origin of Plaintiff's brand of goods and services.

30. The confusion, mistake or deception referred to herein arises out of the aforementioned acts of the Defendants and the acts of the Defendants constitute false designation of origin and unfair completion in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act.

31. Upon information and belief, the aforesaid acts of the Defendants were undertaken willfully with the intention of causing confusion, mistake or deception. Plaintiff is entitled, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117, to recovery of: (1) Defendants' profits; (2) Plaintiff's damages, including lost profits; and (3) costs of the action. Plaintiff is further entitled to treble damages above the amount of actual damages in a sum not more than three times the amount of actual damages. Defendants' willful

and egregious actions make this an exceptional case, entitling Plaintiff to an award of attorney fees.

32. By reason of the aforementioned acts by the Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable damage, in an amount not yet ascertained but in an amount to be determined, which damage will continue unless and until enjoined by Order of this Court.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Trademark Dilution Against All Defendants)

[15 U.S.C§1125(c)]

33. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-25 as if set forth fully herein.

34. Plaintiff's registered trademark **臭臭鍋** is distinctive, well known and famous.

35. Defendants' are diluting the distinctiveness of Plaintiff's **臭臭鍋** mark by marketing and selling inferior goods bearing marks virtually identical or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's registered trademark. Upon information and belief, Defendants have engaged in the conduct alleged in these claims, willfully intending to trade on Plaintiff's reputation and/or to cause dilution of the famous and distinctive **臭臭鍋** mark owned by Plaintiff.

36. For example, Defendants market, conduct business, and publicly represent that the  mark is associated or connected to the Defendants' business thereby creating a false designation of origin of Plaintiff's brand of goods and services.

37. Defendants' acts violate 15 U.S.C. §1125(c).

38. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants trademark dilution, Plaintiff has and will suffer damages to its business, reputation and good will, and the loss of royalties and profits that Plaintiff would have made but for Defendants' acts. Upon information and belief, Defendants' acts of infringement have also

1 resulted in substantial profits for the Defendants. The amount of these damages
2 will be proven at trial.

3 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Federal Unfair Competition Against All Defendants)**

5 **[15 U.S.C §1125(a)]**

6 39. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in
7 paragraphs 1-32 as if set forth fully herein.

8 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that since April
9 2012, Defendants have infringed Plaintiff's trademark rights by marketing and
10 selling goods bearing marks virtually identical or confusingly similar to the
11 recognized and distinctive registered trademark  owned by
12 Plaintiff.

13 41. Upon information and belief, Defendants have engaged in the conduct
14 alleged in these claims knowingly and willfully, or alternatively, did not meet their
15 duty of reasonable care.

16 42. Defendants' actions, as alleged herein, were and are likely to deceive
17 the consuming public and therefore constitute unfair and fraudulent business
18 practices in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1125(a).

19 43. Defendants' unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business practices
20 described above present a continuing threat to members of the public in that they
21 are likely to be deceived as to the origin and quality of Plaintiff's products.

22 44. Upon information and belief, Defendants' acts of unfair competition
23 have resulted in substantial profits for the Defendants in an amount to be proven at
24 trial. Defendants' acts of unfair competition have also resulted in damages to
25 Plaintiff caused by diversion of sales, and conveyed sales to Defendants, lost
26 royalties and other damages resulting from irreparable harm to Plaintiff's goodwill.
27 The exact amount of damages will be proven at trial.

28 45. Plaintiff has also incurred costs and attorneys' fees to bring this action.

46. Defendants' conduct has caused and will continue to cause irreparable injury to Plaintiff unless permanently enjoined.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(California Common Law Unfair Competition Against All Defendants)

47. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates in this Cause paragraphs 1-38 above, as though restated herein in full.

48. The Court has jurisdiction over this Cause pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

49. By Defendants' acts complained herein, the Defendants have engaged in unfair competition under the common law of the State of California.

50. For example, Defendants market, conduct business, and publicly represent that Plaintiff's registered trademark **臭臭鍋** is associated or connected to the Defendants' business thereby creating a false designation of origin of Plaintiff's brand of goods and services and unfairly competing with Plaintiff's business.

51. Upon information and belief, the aforesaid acts of the Defendants were undertaken willfully and with the intention of causing confusion, mistake and deception, entitling Plaintiff to an award of exemplary damages and attorneys' fees.

52. The aforesaid acts of the Defendants have caused damage to Plaintiff, in an amount not yet ascertained, but which shall be proven at trial.

53. By reason of the acts of the Defendants alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable damage, which damage will continue unless enjoined by Order of this Court.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unfair Competition Against All Defendants)

[Cal. Bus. Prof. & Code §17200, *et seq.*]

54. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates in this Cause paragraphs 1-46 above, as though restated herein in full.

1 55. The Court has jurisdiction over this Cause pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
2 1367.

3 56. By the acts complained of herein, the Defendants have engaged in
4 unfair competition under Section 17200 of the Business and Professions Code of
5 the State of California.

6 57. Defendants' use of the infringing mark complained of herein
7 constitutes deceptive and misleading advertising and is likely to, and is intended to,
8 cause confusion to the purchasers and potential purchasers of the products.

9 58. For example, Defendants market, conduct business, and publicly
10 represent that the Plaintiff registered trademark  is associated or
11 connected to the Defendants' business thereby creating a false designation of origin
12 of Plaintiff's brand of goods and services.

13 59. Upon information and belief, the aforesaid acts of the Defendants were
14 undertaken willfully and with the intention of causing confusion, mistake and
15 deception, entitling the Defendants to an award of exemplary damages and
16 attorneys' fees.

17 60. The aforesaid acts of the Defendants have caused damage to Plaintiff,
18 in an amount not yet ascertained, but which shall be proven at trial.

19 61. By reason of the acts of the Defendants alleged herein, Plaintiff has
20 suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' acts
21 of unfair business practices alleged herein, is suffering and will continue to suffer
22 irreparable damage, which damage will continue to suffer irreparable damage
23 unless enjoined by Order of this Court.

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //


28 //

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for judgment as follows:

ALL COUNTS

1. That Defendants' and their principals, agents, representatives, servants and employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them be enjoined and restrained:

- a. from using Plaintiff's registered trademark  or any other confusingly similar mark, in connection with the manufacture, sale, advertisement or promotion of any product or any other similar infringement of Plaintiff trademark rights, for product not originating from Plaintiff or authorized by Plaintiff.
 - b. from Diluting any Plaintiff Trademarks, including  mark or any other confusingly similar mark; and
 - c. from engaging in unfair competition by making and selling their products or otherwise using confusingly similar marks, in such a way as to misrepresent the origin of any of the Defendants' products;
 - d. for an order requiring Defendants to deliver up to be impounded during the pendency of this action all materials in Defendants' possession custody or control that include or incorporate products that infringe Plaintiff's trademark rights;
 - e. for compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
 - f. for all gains, profits and advantages derived by Defendants by their infringement of Plaintiff's trademark rights;
 - g. for punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants for their wrongful conduct and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct in the future;

- h. for statutory damages as provided by law;
- i. for a permanent injunction against Defendants, preventing Defendants from any future usage of any identical or similarly confusing marks related to Plaintiff's registered trademark

2. That the Defendants and their principals, agents, representatives, servants and employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them be ordered to recall and deliver up for destruction all products that infringe Plaintiff's trademark rights.

3. That the Court order the impounding and destruction of all equipment, design documents, computer programs, websites and/or hard drives and any and all items related to the infringing mark within the domain and control of the Defendants and their principals, agents, representatives, servants and employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them within seven days of the date of entry of any injunction order or the final judgment herein; and

4. That the Defendants and their principals, agents, representatives, servants and employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them be ordered to engage in corrective advertising to dispel the confusion caused by Defendants' wrongful acts;

5. That within thirty days after service of judgment with notice of entry thereof upon it, the Defendants are required to file with the Court and serve upon Plaintiff's attorneys a written report under oath setting forth in detail the manner in which the Defendant has complied with the foregoing paragraphs;

6. That an accounting be ordered and judgment be rendered against Defendants for all profits wrongfully derived by Defendants by reason of their trademark infringement, false designation of origin, dilution and unfair competition.

11

11

7. All damages adequate to compensate Plaintiff for the Defendants' acts of trademark infringement, false designation of origin, dilution and unfair competition;

8. Enhanced damages for Defendants' willful acts and bad faith;

9. An assessment of interest on damages so computed, including prejudgment interest;

10. For a judgment that the Defendant has competed unfairly with Plaintiff in violation of California Common Law Unfair Competition Laws and in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

11. That the Defendant be enjoined from continuing to engage in the unfair and unlawful business practices alleged in this Complaint;

12. Plaintiff's costs and attorneys' fees in pursuing this action; and

13. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem appropriate.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury.

Respectfully Submitted,

DATED: November 30, 2012

ARDENT LAW GROUP, P.C.

By 
Hubert H. Kuo, Esq.
Alexander J. Chang, Esq.
Attorneys of Record for Plaintiff
BOILING POINT CORPORATION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT “1”

United States of America

United States Patent and Trademark Office



Reg. No. 3,802,381

BOILING POINT CORPORATION (CALIFORNIA CORPORATION)

SUITE #E

Registered June 15, 2010

2020 HACIENDA BLVD.
HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CA 91745

Int. Cl.: 43

FOR: RESTAURANT; RESTAURANT SERVICES FEATURING SOUP SERVED IN A WOK
STYLE OR SOUP BOWL. CONTAINING A VARIETY OF MEATS, VEGETABLES AND
TOFU, STINKY TOFU; RESTAURANTS, IN CLASS 43 (U.S. CLS. 100 AND 101).

SERVICE MARK

PRINCIPAL REGISTER

FIRST USE 3-19-2004, IN COMMERCE 3-19-2004.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF CHINESE LETTERING WHICH TRANSLATES AS "STINKY
STINKY WOK" OR "STINKY STINKY POT" IN ENGLISH.

THE NON-LATIN CHARACTERS IN THE MARK TRANSLITERATE TO "TSUO TSUO KUO"
AND THIS MEANS "STINKY STINKY POT" OR "STINKY STINKY WOK" IN ENGLISH.

SER. NO. 77-831,589, FILED 9-21-2009.

CIMMERIAN COLEMAN, EXAMINING ATTORNEY



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David J. Kappos".

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT “2”

ORDER LIST

Guest _____

Hot Soup

Total \$9.99 + Tax \$0.00 Dinner \$10.99

Item	Description	Quantity	Unit Price	Total
1. Tomato & Vegetable Hot Soup	番茄蔬菜湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
2. Tomato & Corn Hot Soup	番茄玉米湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
3. Green Onion & Potato Hot Soup	綠蔥土豆湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
4. Seaweed & Tofu Hot Soup	海帶豆腐湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
5. Tomato & Chicken Hot Soup	番茄雞肉湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
6. Tomato & Beef Hot Soup	番茄牛肉湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
7. Tomato & Pork Hot Soup	番茄豬肉湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
8. Tomato & Seafood Hot Soup	番茄海鮮湯	1	\$3.99	\$3.99
9. Tomato & Vegetable Hot Soup (Vegetarian)	番茄蔬菜湯 (素)	1	\$3.99	\$3.99

Price for Add-on

Item	Description	Price
1. Tomato & Beef	番茄牛柳	\$2.50
2. Tomato & Pork	番茄豬肉	\$2.50
3. Tomato & Lamb	番茄羊排	\$2.50
4. Tomato & Iberico Pork	番茄伊比里亞黑豬肉	\$2.50
5. Tomato & King Oyster Mushroom	番茄菌菇	\$2.50
6. Tomato & Sun-dried Tomato	番茄乾燥太陽番茄	\$2.50
7. Tomato & Fish Fillet	番茄魚片	\$2.50
8. Tomato & Shredded Beef	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
9. Tomato & Shredded Pork	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
10. Tomato & Shredded Lamb	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
11. Tomato & Shredded Iberico Pork	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
12. Tomato & Shredded King Oyster Mushroom	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
13. Tomato & Shredded Fish Fillet	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
14. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Beef	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
15. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Pork	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
16. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Lamb	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
17. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Iberico Pork	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
18. Tomato & Shredded Shredded King Oyster Mushroom	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
19. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Fish Fillet	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
20. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Shredded Beef	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
21. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Shredded Pork	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
22. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Shredded Lamb	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
23. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Shredded Iberico Pork	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
24. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Shredded King Oyster Mushroom	番茄碎肉	\$2.50
25. Tomato & Shredded Shredded Shredded Fish Fillet	番茄碎肉	\$2.50

Price for Tea

Item	Description	Price
1. Tomato & Tomato	蕃茄蕃茄茶	\$1.50
2. Tomato & Fennel	蕃茄洋甘菊茶	\$1.50
3. Tomato & Honey	蕃茄蜂蜜茶	\$1.50
4. Tomato & Lemon	蕃茄檸檬茶	\$1.50
5. Tomato & Orange	蕃茄橘子茶	\$1.50
6. Tomato & Pineapple	蕃茄鳳梨茶	\$1.50
7. Tomato & Melon	蕃茄蜜瓜茶	\$1.50
8. Tomato & Cucumber	蕃茄青瓜茶	\$1.50
9. Tomato & Mint	蕃茄薄荷茶	\$1.50
10. Tomato & Rose	蕃茄玫瑰茶	\$1.50
11. Tomato & Lemongrass	蕃茄檸檬草茶	\$1.50
12. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
13. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
14. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
15. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
16. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
17. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
18. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
19. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
20. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
21. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
22. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
23. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
24. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50
25. Tomato & Honeydew	蕃茄木瓜茶	\$1.50